



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,459	04/24/2000	Mark Vincent Shoen	57111-5072	7663

24574 7590 05/14/2004

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO, LLP
1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS, 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Notification of Non-Compliance
With 37 CFR 1.192(c)**

Application No.

09/557,459

Applicant(s)

SHOEN, MARK VINCENT

Examiner

Daniel Yeagley

Art Unit

3611

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 29 January 2004 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three **TIME PERIODS**: (1) **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) **TWO MONTHS** from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. **EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☒ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
4. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
6. ☒ A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and
 - (a) ☐ the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
 - (b) ☒ the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
7. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

The appeal brief is defective because under the heading "STATUS OF CLAIMS"; the brief failed to disclose the status of all the claims in the application; note that the canceled claims 4, 5, 8, 14, 18, 21, and 22 are missing and also note that the canceling of claims 25 and 26 within the Appeal Brief is improper, these claims need to be canceled in a separate after-final amendment and then stated thereto under the heading of "STATUS OF AMENDMENTS". The appeal brief is further defective because the wording under the heading "RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES" should be --none--; although there is a related patent associated with this case on appeal; the related patent is not being appealed or considered in interference. The appeal brief is still further defective because under the headings of the "GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS" and the "ARGUMENTS"; the arguments should coincide and be directed corresponding to the claims as grouped under the heading "GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS" as standing or falling together.

Lesley D Morris
LESLEY D. MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800